

**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION OF FRESNO COUNTY**

**Monthly Meeting  
November 6, 2002 - 3:00 p.m.**

**Children & Families Commission Offices  
University of California Building  
550 E. Shaw, Suite 230  
Fresno, CA**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: CONSENT AGENDA ITEM 1a**

**Recommendations:**

Approve Commission Minutes – October 2, 2002 Meeting

**MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 MEETING**

**Present:** Commissioners Marion Karian, Roseanne Lascano, Kathleen McIntyre, LeeAnn Parry, Oscar Sablan and Gary Zomalt; Executive Director Steve Gordon, Commission Counsel Holley Perez

**Absent:** Chair Bob Waterston (excused), Vice Chair Luisa Medina (unexcused), Secretary/Treasurer Gary Carozza (excused)

Chair Pro Tem Gary Zomalt called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.; a quorum was established. The Chair Pro Tem started the meeting with Agenda Item 2, the informational presentation on Babies First.

**2. A Community Response to the Needs of Substance-Exposed Children – Informational presentation**

Connie Woodman, Fresno County HSS/Maternal Child and Adolescent Health Division, introduced the Babies First program that Fresno County has received federal Healthy Start funding to implement to reduce infant mortality. Through the Babies First program, a broad-based group of county departments and medical providers have joined together to form a local “Children’s Planning Group” which has been working with the Children’s Research Triangle in Chicago which has developed a research-based model, funded through National Institutes of Health, to look at the long-term outcomes of children with prenatal exposure to substance abuse and in developing comprehensive treatment programs for women and children affected by substance abuse. Approximately 11% of the babies born every year in Fresno County are victims of prenatal exposure to drugs and/or alcohol.

Dr. Ira Chasnoff, President of the Children’s Research Triangle (CRT) and professor of Clinical Pediatrics at the University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, described the program developed by them to combat prenatal substance abuse and treat the victims of such abuse. CRT has been contracted by the federal government to work nationwide with the 90 communities implementing Healthy Start programs to help those communities replicate what has been learned in Chicago. One of the components of Chicago’s model program is a Child Study Center, which is a “one stop” facility providing screening, assessment, referral and treatment for prenatal substance-exposed infants and young children. Since studies show that 80% of the children ending up in the foster care system are there due to drug problems in the family, CRT focuses on the area of substance abuse and its link to child welfare. CRT has been working for three years on a prenatal Screening, Assessment, Referral and Treatment (SART) system, with the majority of

referrals to drug treatment programs. One of these programs includes therapeutic child care and special education services, run by the school district, housed within the treatment center. With the success of the prenatal SART program, CRT is now trying to develop a similar screening, assessment, referral and treatment program for children: a single system through which every child who is at risk can be identified, assessed for their future needs, and that assessment can guide services and appropriate placement. Chasnoff emphasized the need for a “warm handoff” referral system which is based on respect for human values and treatment provided through a centralized center that can act as a medical home for the child to serve all their health needs.

Commissioner Parry recounted her personal experience in trying to get help for an adopted child who suffered from prenatal alcohol exposure and the difficulties involved with the social service and educational systems in even obtaining proper diagnosis and assessment.

## 1. Consent Agenda

- a. Approve Commission Minutes – September 2, 2002
- b. Receive Financial Report for August, 2002
- c. Approve Policy on Funding Entities Currently Receiving Prop. 10 Funds

Commissioner McIntyre asked that Item 1(c) be pulled.

**Public Comment:** None

***Commissioner Lascano (McIntyre second) moved to approve the remaining items on the consent agenda. Motion approved unanimously.***

### c. Approve Policy on Funding Entities Currently Receiving Prop. 10 Funds

**Discussion:** Commissioner McIntyre expressed her opinion that she still had some question regarding agencies totally dependent on Prop. 10 funds for their vitality. Although she was willing to have a percentage of total funding be as high as perhaps 90%, she still felt there should be some frame of reference to judge additional funding.

Commissioner Sablan expressed concern that groups providing programs filling identified gaps might be very dependent on Prop. 10 funding, but were providing a much needed service and should not be penalized because of their size.

Commissioner McIntyre said she would still like to see more emphasis on collaboration between organizations rather than the territorialization she sees, with separate agencies requesting funding for the same or very similar programs as if they were each working in a vacuum. Kendra Rogers, Program Operations Director, stated that the new funding mechanisms approved by the Commission allowed for more emphasis to be placed on partnerships and collaboration than could be done solely through the RFP process. In reviewing proposals, staff is now specifically looking at whether Prop. 10 is the most appropriate funding source for a project, whether there is (or could be) a blended funding stream and the overall capacity of the agency to successfully implement the proposed project. Brian Mimura, Planning and Evaluation Director, reviewed the Advisory Committee’s discussion on this issue, with their general feeling that “merit is merit” and “need is need” and there should not be an across the board policy, based on a percentage of their overall budget, that would prohibit an agency from even applying for consideration. The policy, as proposed, will allow, through the current approved funding mechanisms, the

opportunity for organizational capacity and budget to be reviewed on a case by case basis and to the extent that Prop. 10 funds should be utilized for what is being proposed.

**Public Comment:** None.

***Commissioner Sablan (McIntyre second) moved that the proposed policy on funding entities currently receiving Prop. 10 funds be approved as presented. Motion approved unanimously.***

**Commissioner Lascano (McIntyre second) moved to recess to a Public Hearing.**

**3. PUBLIC HEARING: Fiscal Year 2001-02 Annual Report and Fiscal Audit for Children and Families Commission of Fresno County**

Executive Director Gordon reviewed the state requirement for the annual report and fiscal audit, and the process involved in Fresno County for public hearing and adoption. He said the report and audit was presented to the Fresno County Board of Supervisors for review and comment at a public meeting on September 17. Supervisor Case asked about evaluation, and that what was reported was performance-based not outcome and staff explained that an outside firm, Applied Research Center, CSU-Bakersfield, had been hired to do the formal evaluation of all programs funded by Prop. 10 and by the next annual report, there will be outcome-based data available. Case also asked a question on finances, concerned that it appeared the Commission had in the range of \$50 million available. Executive Director Gordon explained to the Board that these funds were all encumbered in funding awards for programs for children 0-5 and their families in Fresno County and will be expended over the next several years; all Proposition 10 funds reported are either encumbered or spent for programs, but are not sitting idly.

**Discussion:** Commissioner Sablan asked what plans there were to hold public forums in outlying communities, as was done when the Commission was first formed. Rogers responded that there were plans, during the next strategic plan review process, to go back out to the communities, particularly those communities where programs are being funded.

**Public Comment:** None

The regular meeting was reconvened.

**4. Discuss and Adopt Fiscal Year 2001-02 Annual Program Report and Fiscal Audit for the Children and Families Commission of Fresno County for submission to the California Children and Families Commission.**

Director Gordon restated his review during the Public Hearing, emphasizing the requirement by the state Children and Families Act that each county produce a program report and fiscal audit. Commission approval is required before the reports are forwarded to the State Commission for filing.

***Commissioners Lascano (McIntyre second) moved to adopt the 2001-02 Annual Report and Fiscal Audit and to forward such reports to the State Commission. Motion approved unanimously.***

**5. Discuss and Approve Commission Supplanting Policy**

Director Gordon reviewed the Commission's request at the last meeting that a letter be sent to the State Commission asking for their input on a more state-wide approach to a supplanting policy and the formation of a local Commission Ad Hoc subcommittee to

further this discussion. Gordon talked to the Executive Director for the State Commission who stated there would be no comment coming from them since their stand is that each county is an independent entity and it is up to them individually to establish policy.

The ad hoc subcommittee on supplanting was convened on September 20, 2002, to discuss the proposed policy. Three (3) members of the Commission (Commissioners Parry, Lascano, and Zomalt) and staff discussed the need for the policy, its intent, content, and relevant issues. Staff presented a supplanting policy for Commission action which was reviewed and revised by an ad hoc subcommittee formed at the Commission's request at the September 4, 2002, Commission meeting.

The content and definitions of the recommended policy do not differ from the policy presented at the September 4, 2002, Commission meeting. The recommended policy includes the following additional language developed by the ad hoc group:

*This policy is not to be construed as limiting creativity in terms of prospective applicants/grantees from proposing blended funding streams from multiple sources (public and private).*

This language was added in order to clarify the Commission's support of applicants utilizing revenue maximization strategies, and that the supplanting policy should not be misconstrued as in any way limiting blended funding approaches.

**Discussion:** Commissioner Sablan asked whether this policy would also apply to federal or private funding sources. Director Gordon stated that the state legislation does not address federal or private funding sources, so staff is recommending that only state and local funding sources be addressed.

**Public Comment:** Vickie Hoyle, Fresno County EOC, asked for the rationale involved in not including federal or private funding. Gordon responded that the staff recommendation only considered what is addressed in the state legislation, which are local and state general funds.

**Commissioner Parry moved (Karian second) to approve the supplanting policy itemized below. Motion approved unanimously.**

### **RECOMMENDED SUPPLANTING POLICY AND DEFINITIONS** **Children & Families Commission of Fresno County**

**Purpose:** The California Children and Families First Act of 1998, and Section 30131.4 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code, states:

"All moneys raised pursuant to taxes imposed by Section 30131.2 shall be appropriated and expended only for the purposes expressed in the California Children and Families First Act and shall be used only to supplement existing levels of service and not to fund existing levels of service. No moneys in the California Children and Families First Trust Fund shall be used to supplant state or local General Fund money for any purpose."

#### **Commission Policy:**

*No Commission funds shall be used to supplant (i.e., take the place of or replace) state or local General Fund money (as defined in the definitions section) for any purpose. This prohibition does not apply to federally funded or privately funded programs.*

*Commission funds shall be used only to supplement (i.e., add to or increase) existing levels of service (as defined in the definitions section) and not to fund existing levels of*

*service. No Commission funds shall be granted or used for services funded by state or local General Funds unless the Commission's funding will improve the quality or quantity of an existing service.*

*The prohibition on supplantation is not intended to prevent, stifle or discourage state or local government agencies from funding pilot programs (as defined in the definitions section), which provide valuable innovations and formation. The prohibition on supplanting therefore does not apply to pilot programs or services.*

Definitions:

State General Fund money is defined as any money received into the treasury of the state and not required by law to be credited to any other fund (Gov. Code 16300). This includes all funds received by the state except those collected by a specific fee or tax for a particular purpose (e.g., Proposition 10 funds, Proposition 99 funds, excise taxes assessed for a particular purpose). State general fund money also includes funds originating from the state treasury (not required to be credited to any other fund) that are subsequently earmarked for a particular use at the county level.

Local General Fund money as pertaining to county is defined as any money received into the treasury of the local government and not specifically appropriated to any other fund (Gov. Code 29301).

Local General Fund money as pertaining to cities, municipalities, or public agencies is defined as any money received into the treasury of the local city, municipality or public agency and not specifically appropriated to any other fund.

Existing services are defined as services in effect or operation at the time a request for funding is acted upon by the Commission, or at any time within the 12-month period preceding the Commission's action.

Pilot programs or services are defined as those activities that are implemented on a temporary and limited basis in order to test and evaluate the effectiveness of the program, develop new techniques, or gather information.

Note: This policy is not to be construed as limiting creativity in terms of prospective applicants/grantees from proposing blended funding streams from multiple sources (public and private).

**6. Discuss Expansion of Child Care Mini-Grant Program**

Rogers reviewed the concern of the Commission at the August meeting when over half of the amount budgeted for child care mini-grants was awarded for the first round, leaving a smaller amount of money and a large pool of requests for funding for the second round, and the Commission's request of staff for an effective way to fulfill both the gap in funding (i.e., the number of requests remaining versus the small amount of funds remaining) and the concerns raised by the review team. Staff has been meeting with various members of the child care community, both trainers and providers, to best address these needs. Based on these discussions, staff plans to return with recommendations similar to the following:

1. The second round of Child Care Mini-Grant applications is due in December 2002 and staff anticipates bringing funding recommendations to the Commission at the February 2003 meeting.

2. After second round awards are made, an invitation will be sent to all providers not recommended for mini-grant funding inviting them to participate in a "Child Care Provider Capacity Building Program". Only those providers who submitted an application through the Mini-Grant Program will be eligible to participate in this program.
3. The Commission will contract with Child Care Mentors to provide one-on-one technical assistance to the child care providers electing to participate in the Capacity Building Program. Each mentor will carry a caseload of approximately 20-25 providers. The mentor will spend approximately 4-5 hours with each provider in the provider's child care environment. The mentors will assist the providers in identifying areas within their environment that could be improved.
4. For their participation in the Capacity Building Program, each provider will be given \$1,000 to help improve those areas identified in the assessment.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Karian expressed concern about insuring that there is an emphasis on the quality of care, not just on having more "things". Rogers said that part of the mentors' task would be to advise on how to improve the quality of care with age appropriate activities, one-on-one nurturing, etc., without an emphasis on having specific equipment, etc.

Commissioner Parry said, long-term, she would like to see some intensive, on-going training being offered to child care providers and also have some minimal standards for quality programs that the Commission would consider adopting. Early Care and Education Coordinator (ECE) Anne Bouhebert said she has been involved in meetings with members of the local ECE community regarding best practices and developing approaches that could be written into policy for First 5 Fresno County.

Commissioner Sablan asked about the limitation of this proposed program to only those who had applied for the mini-grants. He wondered if it might be possible to include some providers who had not actually applied for funding and/or providers who fall into the informal care arena. Rogers responded that approximately 95% of the mini-grant applications submitted are from home-based child care providers and at least a third of those applications are from providers in rural areas.

**Public Comment:** Vickie Hoyle, Fresno County EOC, supported the concept of defining quality care and asked about the relationship between quality care and the need for a livable wage for care providers.

Lilia Chavez, Fresno County Interagency Council, brought up the topic of the numerous exempt providers and the need for training and support in this arena. Rogers said that staff has been working with the State Children & Families Commission on a statewide initiative on informal care, with the anticipation that Fresno County will ultimately participate in this partnership program to improve the quality of child care countywide.

Commissioner Parry advised the Commission of the CORAL efforts occurring in the community. She expressed her concern that the Commission would need to look at a different level of community development than around other kinds of child care situations when considering exempt care providers, and that it will take community development from the ground up to improve the quality of child care countywide.

**7. Advisory Committee Report**

Advisory Committee Chair Dwight Miller addressed the Commission, stating he was honored to be a part of the Commission, reviewing the role of the Advisory Committee and their participation in the establishment of the Commission's focused priority areas. He said continuing discussion has occurred on these priority areas, particularly on the Unintentional Injury Prevention priority area, including the lack of local, age-specific data, a definition of "unintentional injury" and initial areas within the overall priority area to address. Rogers said that discussion at both the advisory committee and staff levels has focused on the definition of unintentional injury vs. intentional injury and the fine line that exists between the two areas, gathering information through conference attendance and consultants, and talking to other County Commissions who are addressing this issue. The result of this is a sense that perhaps the area should be expanded to the broader arena of Child Safety, which would include both intentional and unintentional injury. Staff is still looking at a countywide media campaign on some aspect (or aspects) of child safety, identifying current services being provided and how the Commission can effectively collaborate in this area. Staff is working with the consultant assisting the Orange County Commission with their initiative to tap into how their experience can be best adapted to use in Fresno County.

Miller had Advisory Committee members in attendance introduce themselves.

Commissioner Parry stated she felt the broadening of the priority area would be good because "child safety" was a much more positive approach than limiting to unintentional injury which sounds much more negative.

**8. Public Comment / Announcements**

Michelle Roman, Education Coordinator, KVPT, expressed the station's thanks for the Commission's involvement in and support of the Barney Event held September 21, and particularly the Commission's effort to bus children from rural areas to the event. She stated that approximately 10,000 children and their families attended the event, the largest children's event held to date in the Central Valley. Community feedback since the event has been overwhelmingly positive.

Vickie Hoyle, Fresno County EOC, announced a family resources event to be held at Tehipite Middle School Sat., Oct. 5.

**9. Adjournment:** There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.